

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Claims 2, 4 and 7 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 8 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,450,647, in view of Ejiri, U.S. Patent No. 6,361,171. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raskar, U.S. Patent No. 6,520,647, in view of Takeuchi and Ejiri. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 7 has been cancelled, and independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Independent claims 1 recites "the distortion parameters comprise a distortion central line perpendicular to the projection plane and passing through a coverage point of any set of parallel lines that are not parallel to the projection plane" and "calculating a plurality of coordinates of corners of the distorted object image according to the distortion parameters".

Independent claims 8 recites “the distortion central line is perpendicular to the projection plane and passes through a coverage point of any set of parallel lines that are not parallel to the projection plane” and “calculating the coordinates of the corners of the distorted object image according to the distorted side, the location of the distortion central line and the distortion ratio”.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above combinations of steps as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 8 are not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Takeuchi discloses an image processing method. Although the Examiner asserted that Takeuchi discloses setting an arbitrary point KP on the X and Y coordinates and this arbitrary point is the intersection of extensions of the two sides of the image, Takeuchi fails to teach that the distortion parameter includes a location of a distortion central line of the distorted object image as recited in claim 1.

In addition, the Examiner correctly indicated that Takeuchi fails to teach “calculating a plurality of coordinates of corners of the distorted object image according to the distortion parameters” as recited in claim 1 and “calculating the coordinates of the corners of the distorted object image according to the distorted side, the location of the distortion central line and the distortion ratio” as recited in claim 8. However, the Examiner asserted that Ejiri discloses a bright spot method to acquire the coordinates of the corners of the distorted image (see FIGs. 11 and 13) and that the bright spot method teaches the calculating steps as recited in claims 1 and 8. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As shown in FIGs. 11 and 13 of Ejiri, the bright spot method requires the user to manually move the cursor 1101 to four desirable coordinates to specify an amount of distortion (see col. 7, lines 8-21). In other words, the coordinates of the four corners of the distorted object image are acquired by manual operation of the user. Ejiri fails to teach that the coordinates of the four corners of the distorted object image are calculated according to the distortion parameters as recited in claim 1 or according to the distorted side, the location of the distortion central line and the distortion ratio as recited in claim 8. Therefore, Ejiri also fails to cure the deficiencies of Takeuchi.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Raskar, this reference has only been relied on to reject claim 7. Since claim 7 has been cancelled and Raskar has not been utilized to reject claims 1-6 and 8, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 8 or dependent claims from claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.


It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Reg. No. 32,334 #43,368

KM/GH/mmi/asc  
0941-0421P

477

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000